

PRETHODNO PRIOPĆENJE

PRELIMINARY COMMUNICATION

UDK: 338.48:001.895

JEL classification: Z32 O31

Chris COOPER *

**IZAZOVI ZA INOVACIJE U TURIZMU:
REVITALIZACIJA ZRELIH DESTINACIJA****CHALLENGING TOURISM CONTEXTS FOR INNOVATION:
THE REVITALISATION OF MATURE DESTINATIONS**

SAŽETAK: Inovacije su ključne za održivost i konkurentnost destinacija. Zrele destinacije hladnih mora/voda suočavaju se sa specifičnim izazovima prilikom uvođenja inovacija u svrhu svoje revitalizacije. Ovaj rad istražuje okolnosti tih destinacija s obzirom na karakteristike ponude i potražnje te analizira u kojoj mjeri one mogu potaknuti ili onemogućiti uvođenje inovacija. U radu se navode čimbenici uspjeha poput potrebe za postojanjem šampiona, cjelovitog pristupa razvoju destinacije i odgovarajućih financijskih sredstava za revitalizaciju. Na kraju, u radu se analiziraju okolnosti za inovacije u određenju poput krajolika dionika, analize mreža i 'zajednica prakse'.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: inovacija, pomlađivanje, analiza mreža, zajednice prakse

SUMMARY: Innovation is essential for the sustainability and competitiveness of destinations. Mature cold-water destinations face particular challenges when innovating to revitalise. This paper examines the context of these destinations in terms of their demand and supply side characteristics and goes on to analyse this context in terms of its ability to promote or hinder innovation. Success factors are identified which include the need for a champion, a whole of destination approach and adequate financing for revitalisation. Finally the paper analyses resort contexts for innovation in terms of their stakeholder landscape, network analysis and communities of practice.

KEY WORDS: innovation, rejuvenation, network analysis, communities of practice

* Professor Chris Cooper, Faculty of Business, Oxford Brookes University, UK, e-mail: ccooper@brookes.ac.uk

1. UVOD

Inovacije u razvoju turizma pojavljuju se u raznim zemljopisnim okruženjima i prilikama. Ovaj rad analizira okolnosti u kojima se inovacije uvode u zrelih obalnim destinacijama – destinacijama koje inovacije trebaju uvoditi i da bi opstale i da bi se revitalizirale. Kao primjeri turističkog razvoja one predstavljaju poseban sklop prilika za uvođenje inovacija pa je stoga važno razumjeti i samu prirodu tih destinacija i načine na koje one utječu na procese inovacija (Agarwal, 2012b). U ovom radu zastupa se mišljenje da, ako se okolnosti zrelih destinacija promatraju kao složene umrežene organizacije, može se doći do vrijednih saznanja o procesima uvođenja inovacija i o tome gdje i zašto one ne uspijevaju. To je osobito važno uzme li se u obzir da su participativni pristupi postali ključni za postupke revitalizacije (Saxena, 2014) te se od dionika u odredištu traži da se u taj proces uključe i da ga podržavaju. Ovaj rad ukazuje na važnost analiziranja mrežnih struktura odredišta jer one utječu na to kako se dionici organiziraju i kako reaguju.

2. STRATEGIJE REVITALIZACIJE I KRITERIJI ZA USPJEŠNOST

Na sjevernoj hemisferi velik broj obalnih odredišta, stvorenih u devetnaestom stoljeću i ranije, danas je u silaznoj putanji. Uzrok tome je sve manji broj turističkih posjeta što je dovelo do stvaranja problema vezanih uz gospodarstvo i okoliš. Do toga je djelomično došlo zbog promjena u ukusima i modi, ali i zbog privlačnosti drugih konkurentskih destinacija u svijetu (Cooper, 1997, 2006; Shaw i Williams, 1997). Ta odredišta nastoje adekvatno odgovoriti na promjene, ali ih njihova fiksirana izgrađena okolina drži zarobljenima u prošlosti. Takve su destinacije nekad bile posebne – izuzetni krajolici za odmor, u potpunoj suprotnosti prema onima u koji-

1. INTRODUCTION

Innovation for tourism development occurs in different geographic settings and contexts. This paper analyses the context for innovation in mature coastal destinations – destinations, which must innovate to both, survive and revitalise. As examples of tourism development, they represent a particular context for innovation and it is therefore important to understand both the nature of the destinations themselves and their influence upon processes of innovation (Agarwal, 2012b). This paper argues that by viewing the context of maturing destinations as complex networked organizations, insights can be gained as to the processes of innovation and where and how it fails. This is particularly important given that participatory approaches have moved centre stage in revitalisation (Saxena, 2014), demanding that resort stakeholders are involved and committed to the process. This paper shows the relevance of analysing resort network structures as they influence both the organisation of, and response by these stakeholders.

2. REVITALISATION STRATEGIES AND SUCCESS CRITERIA

In the northern hemisphere, a number of the coastal resorts created in the nineteenth century and earlier, now find themselves in decline. This is due to falling tourism visitation which has led to both economic and environmental malaise. This is in part the result of changing taste and fashion with the lure of competing global alternatives (Cooper, 1997, 2006; Shaw and Williams, 1997). These resorts have struggled to respond to their changing conditions and their fixed built environment traps them in a time warp. Such destinations were once special – extraordinary leisure landscapes contrasting

ma su posjetitelji inače živjeli – ali u poslijeratnom razdoblju rad i odmor prestali su se strogo odvajati pa su te destinacije izgubile na svojoj privlačnosti (Walton, 1983). Ipak, važno je razmotriti ta pitanja iz perspektive razvoja. Ta su odredišta zajednice u kojima se živi, često su i središta svojih regija u kojima je turizam važan za održavanje gospodarstva, infrastrukture i sadržaja (Leonard, 2016).

Sa stanovišta razvoja, rasprava o revitalizaciji počinje sredinom osamdesetih i ubrzava se u devedesetim godinama prošlog stoljeća, kad niz destinacija i u političkom i financijskom smislu počinje shvaćati nužnost upravljanja promjenama. Coles i Shaw (2006) primjećuju da u Velikoj Britaniji politika osobitu pažnju posvećuje obalnim gradovima smatrajući da su oni održivi u budućnosti. Pojavilo se niz strateških rješenja koja su uključivala ideje da se te destinacije prepuste drugim namjenama poput rezidencijalnih ili zdravstvenih, ili da ih se revitalizira inovativnim rješenjima i pristupima. Ovaj rad bavi se upravo ovom drugom opcijom.

Uspješne strategije revitalizacije zahtijevaju inovacije kako bi se stvorili novi proizvodi i našla nova tržišta. One također prepoznaju potrebu za neprestanim preispitivanjem i prilagođavanjem destinacijskih formula. Otkad je ta rasprava počela, na osnovu iskustava mnogih destinacija diljem svijeta, stvoren je korpus znanja o najboljim praksama i kriterijima uspješnosti revitalizacije odredišta. Naravno, svaka destinacija ima svoje specifičnosti i izazove, ali je zanimljivo da se njihovi osnovni ciljevi, svrhe i alati nisu promijenili bez obzira na promjenu strategija tijekom godina (Coles i Shaw, 2006). Saxena (2014) primjećuje da se fokus u politici i načinu upravljanja pomaknuo prema lokalnom ili prema destinaciji umjesto prema velikim regionalnim strategijama. Saxena (2014) predlaže sljedeću klasifikaciju strategija revitalizacije:

1. Objektivne strategije koje nastoje transformirati mjesta koja imaju određeni

with the visitor's home environment, but in the post-war period, work and play ceased to be separate and the destinations no longer appeal (Walton, 1983). Yet from a development perspective it is important that these issues are addressed. These resorts are living communities, often regional centres, where tourism is woven into their very fabric to support economic activity, infrastructure and amenities (Leonard, 2016).

From a development point of view the debate on revitalisation began in the mid-1980s and accelerated in the 1990s with a range of destinations committing both politically and financially to the need to manage change. Coles and Shaw (2006) observe that in the UK, the policy environment has been largely supportive towards seaside towns with the inherent assumption that they have sustainable futures. The strategic options that emerged were to abandon these destinations to other uses such as residential or healthcare, or to revitalize through innovative solutions and approaches. It is this latter option that this paper focuses upon.

Successful revitalisation strategies demand innovation to deliver new products and seek out new markets. They also recognise the need to constantly review and adjust the destination formula. Since the debate began, a body of knowledge has emerged from the experience of many destinations worldwide in terms of best practice and success criteria for resort revitalisation. Clearly each destination has its own particular set of issues and considerations but interestingly whilst the passing of these strategies has changed over the years, the basic aims, objectives and tools have remained the same (Coles and Shaw, 2006). Saxena (2014) observes a shift in policy and governance style to a more local, or destination focus and away from grand regional strategies. Saxena (2014) suggests a twofold classification of revitalisation strategies:

1. Objective strategies designed to transform places suffering from a particular

problem – poput odredišta. Ovdje strategija ‘gura’ odredište prema potencijalnim ulagačima i alternativnim izvorima financiranja.

2. Subjektivne strategije koje se nastoje pozabaviti negativnim imidžem putem pristupa ‘povlačenja’ “komunicirajući s potencijalnim stanovnicima, poslovnim subjektima i pružateljima usluga o prednostima života i rada u tim područjima koristeći marketinške kampanje i događanja kojima je cilj izgraditi profil tog područja” (Saxena, 2014:97).

Temeljem međunarodnih iskustava moguće je izvesti niz ključnih indikatora uspjeha za revitalizaciju odredišta. Oni obuhvaćaju pronalaženje lokalnog političkog ili poslovnog šampiona, političku volju za uvođenjem promjene, holističko gledanje na destinaciju koje obuhvaća sve gospodarske, društvene čimbenike i čimbenike okoline te vještine potrebne da se osiguraju investicije i regionalna financijska pomoć. Najvažnija su sljedeća tri kriterija za uspješnost strategija:

Vizija, planiranje i vodstvo

Ključni su vizija, planiranje i vodstvo, osobito u ranim fazama revitalizacije. U velikom broju izvješća i u literaturi lokalni šampion istaknut je kao najvažniji čimbenik uspjeha za revitalizaciju (vidi npr. Blackpool Challenge Partnership, bez datuma; Market and Coastal Towns Association, 2011). Šampion vodi proces i stvara viziju, ali potrebna je i snažna politička volja da se u tome i uspije. Kako navodi Healy (2006:527) „strateško prostorno planiranje samo po sebi predstavlja složen proces upravljanja“. Drugim riječima, političkim procesom revitalizacije treba upravljati na način da se u njega uključi cijela lokalna zajednica, kao i sastavnice koje često nemaju interesa u turizmu – poput onih u ruralnom zaleđu odredišta te da se upravlja međusobno suprotstavljenim dionicima u odredištu. Na uspjeh ili neuspjeh toga procesa može utjecati mrežna konfiguracija same destinacije.

issue – such as resorts. Here the strategy ‘pushes’ the resort to potential investors and funders; and

2. Subjective strategies which attempt to address negative images through a ‘pull’ approach “communicating with likely residents, businesses and service providers about the advantages of being in the area through the use of marketing campaigns and profile-building events” (Saxena, 2014:97).

It is possible to distil a range of key indicators of success for resort revitalisation from international experience. These include finding a local political or business champion, the political will to drive through change, a holistic view of the destination that encompasses all economic, social and environmental factors, and the skills to secure investment and regional aid. The following three success criteria are central to successful strategies:

Vision, planning and leadership

Vision, planning and leadership are critical, particularly in the early stages of revitalisation. A local champion for the process is the single most important success factor for regeneration, identified in a number of reports and in the literature (see for example, Blackpool Challenge Partnership, no date; Market and Coastal Towns Association, 2011). Whilst the champion drives the process and creates a vision, they must also be supported by a strong political will to succeed – as Healy (2006:527) notes “strategic spatial planning endeavours are themselves complex governance processes”. In other words, the political process of revitalisation must be managed by engaging with the resort community, involving constituencies who often have no tourism interest – such as those in rural resort hinterlands, and managing the conflicting stakeholders in the resort. Here, success or failure of this process can be influenced by the network configuration of the destination itself.

Holistički pristup

Naredni imperativ je pristupiti revitalizaciji na holistički način. Drugim riječima, turističke planove treba integrirati u planove drugih gospodarskih sektora i društvenih čimbenika. Za to je važna čvrsta integracija razvoja fizičkih proizvoda (kongresnih centara, novih turističkih atrakcija, podizanje statusa okoliša na višu razinu) i promocije odredišta. Sve se veća pažnja posvećuje kvaliteti izgrađenog okoliša planiranjem oblikovanja krajolika, oblikovanjem izgleda ulica, kulturnom nasljeđu te izradi projekata vezanih uz njega i integraciji zelenih površina u poslovne četvrti odredišta. Usto, sve se više pažnje pridaje i podizanju statusa okoliša – na Majorci, na primjer, 30 posto površine otoka proglašeno je zaštićenim područjem. Ovaj pristup podrazumijeva razvoj glavnih zona za posjetitelje u kojima trguje i lokalno stanovništvo kao i zona u kojima se posjetiteljima nude ugostiteljske i trgovinske usluge, što je slučaj u Manlyju u Australiji. Drugim riječima, potrebno je integrirati planiranje infrastrukture i prijevoza koje obuhvaća potrebe kako posjetitelja tako i stanovnika. Na kraju, sve se više pažnje posvećuje sigurnosnim pitanjima, poput problema sigurnosti posjetitelja i zlouporabe alkohola te se, primjerice, koriste usluge turističke policije i video nadzor, na što lokalno stanovništvo dobro reagira.

Osiguravanje financijskih sredstava

Revitalizacija zahtijeva velika financijska sredstva i veoma je važno da se uz lokalna financijska sredstva uspješno dođe i do regionalnih, nacionalnih i internacionalnih izvora financiranja. To se osobito odnosi na Europu gdje je do novca moguće doći putem strukturnih fondova za regionalni razvoj. U nizu odredišta taj je proces olakšan osnivanjem privatno-javnih upravljačkih odbora koji u taj proces nastoje uključiti različite skupine. Također je važno privući unutarnje investicije i naći financijska sredstva za poboljšanje smještaja i sadržaja.

A holistic approach

A second imperative is to take a holistic approach to revitalisation, in other words integrating tourism plans with plans for other sectors of the economy, including social factors. Here, close integration of physical product development (convention centres, new attractions, environmental upgrading) with the promotion of the resort is important. There is increasing attention being given to the quality of the built environment through the planning process of landscaping, street-scape, heritage considerations with design briefs and the integration of green-spaces in resort business districts. In addition, priority is being given to environmental upgrading – in Majorca for example, 30% of the island's area has been set aside as a natural preservation area. This approach also includes development of core visitor precincts that draw upon the local residential market as well as visitors with food and beverage and retail precincts, as in Manly, Australia. This recognises the need to closely link day visitor and staying market facilities with the residential market catchment. In other words, integrated infrastructure and transport planning is needed that *plans in* the needs of visitors as well as residents. Finally, increasing attention is being given to security issues to manage issues such as visitor safety and alcohol abuse, through the use of say, tourist police or CCTV installation. This clearly plays well with the residential community.

Securing resources

Revitalisation is resource intensive and it is vital to be able to successfully access regional, national and international funding to augment local sources. This is particularly the case in Europe where European monies are available through the structural funds for regional development. In a number of resorts this process is facilitated by development of public/private sector steering committees to ensure that various groups *buy into* the process. It is also critical to attract inward

3. SKLOP PRILIKA ZA ODREDIŠTA U SAZRIJEVANJU

Postoji nedovoljno razumijevanje istraživača o odredištima u fazi sazrijevanja i nedostatak inicijativa za ciljanim politikama prema njima (Shared Intelligence, bez datuma). U mnogim zemljama prostori odredišta zauzimaju posebno mjesto u urbanom krajo-liku i u mnoge od njih u značajnoj se mjeri doseljavaju ne samo umirovljenici, već i stariji, ekonomski aktivni pojedinci koje privlači ugodnost obalnih lokacija (Beatty i Fothergill, 2004; Leonard, 2016). Takva su odredišta odnedavna postala predmetom istraživanja, djelomično i zbog specifičnih ekonomskih, društvenih i okolišnih izazova do kojih je dovela promjena njihove uloge. Ti izazovi pokazali su se znatno različitim od onih u gradovima koji su suočeni s promjenama uzrokovanim nestankom industrije. Prikuplja se sve više znanja o zrelim odredištima zahvaljujući velikim projektima koji oblikuju njihove društvene i gospodarske dimenzije (vidi Beatty *et al.*, 2008; Beatty *et al.*, 2009; McElduff *et al.*, 2013), a jedan veliki europski projekt ustanovio je indikatore ranog upozorenja za odredišta (European Commission, 2002). Neki od radova koji se bave gospodarskim i društvenim okruženjem u odredištima analiziraju gospodarske veze u lokalnim ekonomijama (Agarwal, 2012a); istraživanjem prostornih dimenzija restrukturiranja odredišta (Agarwal, 2012b); detaljnom analizom društvene isključenosti (Agarwal i Brunt, 2006); istraživanjem tržišta rada odredišta (Beatty i Fothergill, 2004); usmjerenosću na ključnu ulogu restrukturiranja smještaja u procesu revitalizacije (Clegg i Essex, 2000); analizom migracija (Leonardo, 2016) i ulogom nekretnina kao ključnog sredstva ekonomske promjene u odredištima (Cole i Shaw, 2006). Druga istraživanja i izvještaji bave se mogućim rješenjima revitalizacije (Communities and Local Government, 2010; House of Commons, 2007; Saxena, 2014; Shared Intelligence, bez datuma).

investment and to find resources to upgrade accommodation and facilities.

3. THE CONTEXT OF MATURING RESORTS

Maturing resorts are little understood and until recently have not been the focus of either research or targeted policy initiatives (Shared Intelligence, no date). In many countries their resort spaces occupy a particular place in the urban landscape, often with substantial in-migration, not only of retirees but also of older economically active individuals, attracted by the amenity values of a coastal location (Beatty and Fothergill, 2004; Leonard, 2016). These resorts have been the focus of more recent research, partly due to the particular economic, social and environmental challenges that their changing role has created. These challenges are proving to be very different from towns experiencing industrial decline. In response, the knowledge base for maturing resorts is expanding with major projects calibrating their social and economic dimensions (see Beatty *et al.*, 2008; Beatty *et al.*, 2009; McElduff *et al.*, 2013), whilst a major European project has designed early warning indicators for resorts (European Commission, 2002). Work on the economic and social landscape of resorts includes Agarwal's (2012a) analysis of economic linkages in resort economies; Agarwal's (2012b) examination of the spatial dimensions of resort restructuring; Agarwal and Brunt's (2006) detailed analysis of social exclusion; Beatty and Fothergill's (2004) examination of resort labour markets; Clegg and Essex (2000) focus on the key role of accommodation restructuring in the revitalisation process; Leonard's (2016) analysis of migration; and Coles and Shaw's (2006) paper on the role of property as a key medium for economic change in resorts. Other studies and reports have examined the options for revitalisation (Communities and Local Government, 2010; House of Commons, 2007; Saxena, 2014; Shared Intelligence, no date).

U navedenim radovima tvrdi se da je svako odredište različito i da generalizacije ne pomažu pri razvijanju strategija i traženju rješenja problema njihovog nazadovanja, osobito kad je riječ o veličini odredišta (Agarwal, 2012b; Agarwal i Brunt, 2006). Međutim, u tim odredištima jasno se vide ključni elementi turističkih destinacija. Jedan od njih je inherentan sukob lokalnih dionika i nepopustljivi interesi politike u malim gradovima gdje je obično sva pažnja usmjerena na samo odredište umjesto na njegov odnos prema svijetu. Turizam je fragmentirani sustav u kojem su mala i srednja poduzeća usredotočena na sebe same i po prirodi su konkurentna (za više primjera utjecaja fragmentacije na implementaciju strategija vidi Agarwal, 2012a). Te destinacije imaju dva specifična obilježja koja utječu na potencijalan uspjeh ili neuspjeh revitalizacije. Prvo, njima dominiraju mala poduzeća koja se sastoje od samo jedne osobe ili su obiteljska te im nedostaje menadžerskih vještina i/ili obrazovanja. Takva poduzeća imaju izuzetno instrumentalistički pogled na to kako će revitalizacija utjecati na njihovo poslovanje te ona mora biti izravno vrlo važna za njihov rad kako bi se u nju uključile. To znači da je za revitalizaciju ključna djelotvorna komunikacija o svim planovima i strategijama.

Drugo, kao i kod svih destinacija, pružanje turističkog proizvoda je fragmentirano nizom pružatelja usluga, od smještaja do prijevoza. To znači da nitko nije vlasnik cjelokupnog procesa kreiranja doživljaja, a posljedica toga je loša koordinacija strategija i planova. Stoga vođenje destinacije ovisi o javnom sektoru, često o lokalnim organizacijama za upravljanje destinacijom (DMO). Stoga se DMO-i suočavaju s izazovom da prilikom izrade strategija revitalizacije surađuju sa svim dionicima odredišta i da ih temeljito upoznaju sa strategijama. Međutim, destinacije nemaju linije odgovornosti koje nalazimo, na primjer, u organizacijama u privatnom sektoru, što znači da DMO-i nemaju autoritet nad dionicima u destinaciji i u svojem se radu moraju služiti uvjerenjima

Whilst these reports argue that each resort is distinctive and that generalisations are not helpful when developing strategies and solutions to decline – especially in terms of the importance of resort size, (Agarwal, 2012b; Agarwal and Brunt, 2006), such resorts do demonstrate the core elements of a tourism destination. This includes inherent local stakeholder conflict and the entrenched interests of small town politics, where the resort itself is the focus and its relationship with the wider world is missed. Tourism is a fragmented sector and SMEs are focussed on their own businesses and are competitive by nature (see Agarwal, 2012a for examples of fragmentation impacting upon strategy implementation). These destinations have two particular characteristics which impact upon the potential success or otherwise of revitalisation. Firstly, they are dominated by small enterprises which are often single person or family-owned, lacking managerial expertise and/or training. These enterprises take a singularly instrumental view about how their business will be impacted by revitalisation and it must be highly relevant to their operation if they are to buy into it. This means that effective communication of any plans and strategies is vital. Secondly, as with all destinations, delivery of the tourism product is fragmented across a variety of providers from accommodation to transportation. This implies a lack of ownership for the total experience and hence poor coordination for strategies and plans. This results in destination leadership being dependent upon the public sector, often the local destination management organisation (DMO). The challenge for DMOs is therefore to collaboratively develop revitalisation strategies with all resort stakeholders and to effectively communicate the strategy. However, destinations do not exhibit the lines of responsibility found in say, private sector organizations, which means that DMOs have no authority over destination stakeholders and must operate by persuasion and influence. Public

i pozicijom moći. Usto, vodstvo u javnom sektoru ometaju godišnji ciklusi donošenja proračuna i općeniti nedostatak stručnosti.

Pored toga, Weidenfeld *et al.* (2009) turizam vide kao sektor kojeg karakterizira niska razina spremnosti na izlaganje rizicima, skromni financijski resursi za investiranje, nedostatak povjerenja i suradnje među poduzećima te brza fluktuacija kako poduzeća, tako i zaposlenika. Tim karakteristikama možemo dodati i probleme vezane uz stručno osoblje koje uzrokuju loše prakse upravljanja ljudskim resursima protivne kontinuitetu strategija i planova. To se odnosi na zapošljavanje sezonskih radnika i radnika na pola radnog vremena, veliku fluktuaciju radne snage i slabo kvalificiran sektor koji smanjuje apsorpcijsku sposobnost turističkih organizacija i destinacija.

Set okolnosti odredišta za revitalizaciju i inovacije

Iako je moguće poopćavati proces revitalizacije, u stvarnosti se ona odvija u specifičnim okolnostima odredišta. Stoga je nužno razumjeti okolnosti u kojima se odvija uspješna revitalizacija odredišta. Zadnje poglavlje rada istražuje tri specifična seta okolnosti destinacija:

1. Odredišta kao krajolici inovacija sastavljenih od dionika koji istovremeno onemogućavaju, dopuštaju i prihvataju inovacije i revitalizaciju (vidi Rowley, 1997);
2. Destinacije kao umrežene organizacije;
3. Destinacije kao zajednice prakse (Schianetz *et al.*, 2007).

Odredišta kao krajolici inovacija

Inovacije podupiru revitalizaciju i na njih se može gledati kao na "proces pretvaranja znanja i ideja u vrijednost" (Dvir i Pasher, 2004:16). Procesi inovacija za destinacije sve su više interaktivni, protežu se preko cjelokupnog krajolika destinacijskih organizacija i temelje se na znanjima prikupljenim unutar, ali i izvan destinacije (Alguezaui i Filie-

sector leadership is also handicapped by annual budgeting rounds and a general lack of expertise.

In addition, Weidenfeld *et al.* (2009) see tourism as a sector characterised by low risk takers, a low level of resources for investment, lack of trust and collaboration amongst businesses, and rapid turnover of both businesses and employees. We can also add to these characteristics, vocational reinforcers rooted in poor human resource practices which militate against the continuity of strategies and plans. These include the employment of seasonal and part-time workers, high labour turnover and a poorly qualified sector which inhibits the absorptive capability of tourism organisations and destinations.

Resort contexts for revitalisation and innovation

Whilst it is possible to generalise on the process of revitalisation, in reality it occurs within particular resort contexts. An imperative for understanding successful revitalisation therefore lies in understanding the resort context within which it occurs. This final section of the paper examines three specific destination contexts:

1. Resorts as innovation landscapes comprised of stakeholders who act as barriers, gatekeepers and receptors of innovation and revitalisation (see Rowley, 1997); and
2. Destinations as networked organisations; and
3. Destinations as communities of practice (Schianetz *et al.*, 2007).

Resorts as innovation landscapes

Innovation underpins revitalisation and can be thought of as 'the process of turning knowledge and ideas into value' (Dvir and Pasher, 2004:16). Innovation processes for destinations are increasingly interactive, occurring across landscapes of destination organisations and drawing upon a knowledge base that is both within and across the des-

ri, 2010; Swan *et al.*, 1999). Međutim, kad se inovacije uvode i kad ih treba prihvatiti u destinacijama (a i šire u turizmu), lideri su uvijek malobrojni, a mnogo je onih koji odbijaju bilo kakve promjene. Riječ je o sektoru u kojemu se inovacije sporo uvode, a nove ideje teško prihvaćaju (Hall i Williams, 2008; Hjalager, 2010; OECD, 2006). Djelomično se to može objasniti činjenicom da inovacije potrebne za revitalizaciju obično ovise o inovacijama u pružanju usluga, a ne o inovacijama u proizvodnji (vidi Kanerva *et al.*, 2006; Nijssen *et al.*, 2006). Inovacije u uslugama karakteriziraju:

- Potreba za razumijevanjem i ugradnjom preduvjeta za pružanje usluge, kao i razumijevanjem same usluge;
- Razumijevanje činjenice da će razvoj nove usluge i postojeće aktivnosti u destinaciji biti čvrsto povezane;
- Inkorporiranje postojećeg znanja pružatelja usluga pri čemu ti dionici mogu pomicati granice i otvarati se i prema znanjima koja dolaze izvana (vidi Shaw i Williams, 2009; Yang i Wan, 2004).

Kad se razmatraju okolnosti odredišta za te vrste inovacija, možemo zamisliti situaciju u kojoj u sustavu odredišta istovremeno postoje oni koji inovacije i revitalizaciju onemogućavaju, dopuštaju i prihvaćaju (vidi Cooper *et al.*, 2003). U tom su procesu ključni sljedeći elementi sustava odredišta:

- Izvori i autentičnost znanja koje imaju dionici, kao i njegova kvaliteta i pouzdanost;
- Karakteristike onih koji prihvaćaju inovacije i njihov kapacitet prihvaćanja – drugim riječima, točka do koje se nove ideje prenose i način na koji se šire. Neki od važnih čimbenika su veličina organizacije te struktura i kompetencije primatelja. U turizmu je važan koncept apsorpcijske sposobnosti (vidi Cohen i Levinthal, 1990). Mnogim korisnicima znanja o turizmu nedostaje iskustva u tome području. Na primjer, mala poduzeća

(Alguezaui and Filieri, 2010; Swan *et al.*, 1999). Yet, innovation and its adoption in destinations (and indeed in tourism more generally) has been characterized by few leaders and many laggards, leading to a sector that has been both slow to innovate and to adopt new ideas (Hall and Williams, 2008; Hjalager, 2010; OECD, 2006). In part this can be explained by the fact that innovation for revitalisation tends to rely upon innovations in service delivery rather than manufacturing (see Kanerva *et al.*, 2006; Nijssen *et al.*, 2006). Innovation in services is characterised by:

- The need to understand and build-in the pre-conditions for delivering the service, as well as the service itself;
- Recognition that there will be a close relationship between the new service development and the existing destination activity; and
- Incorporation of the tacit knowledge base of those delivering the service and the fact that those stakeholders can act as boundary spanners allowing access to external knowledge (see Shaw and Williams, 2009; Yang and Wan, 2004).

When considering the resort context for these types of innovations, we can envisage a landscape of adoption where the resort system is comprised of barriers, gatekeepers and receptors of innovation (see Cooper *et al.*, 2003). The following elements of the resort system are critical in the process:

- The sources and legitimacy of knowledge held by stakeholders, as well as the quality and reliability of the knowledge base;
- Adopter characteristics and capacity to adopt – in other words the point to which new ideas are transferred to, and how they are deployed. Here, relevant factors include organizational size, structure and competence of the adopter. In tourism the concept of absorptive capability is relevant (see Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). Many users of tourism knowledge lack

prihvatit će nove ideje samo ako su vrlo važne za njihov rad. Agarwal (2012a) na primjeru Newquaya pokazuje probleme s kojima se planeri i menadžeri u određenim suočavaju u svojem nastojanju da odgovore na globalne promjene. Pojam kapaciteta organizacije odnosi se na premošćivanje rascjepa između namjere i rezultata. S korisnikove točke gledišta, taj se model odnosi na sposobnost prihvatanja i primjene novih ideja, sposobnost djelovanja i poboljšavanja na temelju znanja i transformiranja što je moguće više ideja vezanih uz inovacije;

- Stupanj sličnosti između partnera unutar mreže u destinaciji, s obzirom na interese, obilježja ili obrazovanje, povezan je s idejom “zajednice prakse” o kojoj se raspravlja u nastavku;
- Razina znanja koje organizacija posjeduje; što više neka organizacija zna, to je otvorenija za inovacije i nove ideje za revitalizaciju.

4. DESTINACIJE KAO MREŽE

O destinacijama se može razmišljati kao o slabo povezanim spojevima poduzeća, vlasti i drugih organizacija (Scott *et al.*, 2008). Kolektivno, njihovi dionici imaju zajednički cilj postizanja konkurentnosti i održivosti destinacije te uspješne implementacije bilo koje strategije revitalizacije. Rowley (1997:894) smatra da “u analizi dionika fokus treba staviti na međuovisnost svih sudionika i načine na koje njihov položaj unutar mreže utječe na njihove mogućnosti, ograničenja i ponašanja”.

Ovaj rad ide i korak dalje te preporuča promatrati revitalizacijske okolnosti destinacije kao umreženu učeu organizaciju. Učeu organizacije brže se prilagođavaju promjenama i time mogu ostvariti komparativnu prednost (vidi Cooper *et al.*, 2003). Za stvaranje takvih učećih destinacija potrebno je upravljati kapitalom znanja destinacije

experience in the field. Small enterprises for example, will only adopt new ideas if they are highly relevant to their operation. Here, Agarwal (2012a) notes the difficulties faced by resort planners and managers in responding to global forces of change in her Newquay example. This notion of organizational capability is about filling the ‘gap’ between intention and outcome. From the user’s point of view, this model considers the capacity to acquire and apply new ideas, the ability to build or improve upon knowledge and to transform as many new ideas as possible for innovation;

- The degree of partner similarity in terms of interests, background, or education in the destination network relates to the idea of ‘communities of practice’ which are discussed below; and
- The level of organizational self-knowledge, the more an organization knows the more receptive it tends to be to innovation and new ideas for revitalisation.

4. DESTINATIONS AS NETWORKS

Destinations can be thought of as loosely articulated amalgams of enterprises, governments and other organizations (Scott *et al.*, 2008). Collectively, their stakeholders have the overall goal of ensuring both destination competitiveness and sustainability and the successful implementation of any revitalisation strategy. Rowley (1997:894) is clear that the “focus of stakeholder analysis is the interdependence of actors and how their positions in networks influence their opportunities, constraints and behaviours”.

This paper takes this a step further by arguing that it is helpful to view the destination context for revitalisation as a networked learning organisation. Learning organisations adapt to change more quickly and thus can gain competitive advantage (see Cooper *et al.*, 2003). Creation of these learning

koji se pak stvara suradnjom i partnerstvom unutar interorganizacijskih destinacijskih mreža (European Commission, 2006; Hallin i Marnburg 2008; Shaw i Williams, 2009). Društvena interakcija naglašava utjecaj organizacija, odnosa i interakcija na revitalizaciju; drugim riječima, načine na koje dinamika dionika u destinaciji može olakšati ili otežati proces revitalizacije.

Analiza društvenih mreža omogućava mjerenje mrežnih struktura, kalibraciju i klasifikaciju analizom *veza* – slobodnog protoka informacija i suradnje, i *čvorišta* – konkurentne pozicije. To znači da je konfiguracija destinacijske mreže ključna u procesu revitalizacije jer otežava ili potiče izgradnju destinacijskog kapitala te razmjenu znanja i komuniciranje strategije revitalizacije prema dionicima u destinaciji (Braun, 2004; Reagans i McEvily, 2003). Tsai (2001:996) smatra da organizacije u destinacijama mogu biti inovativnije

“ako zauzimaju središnja mjesta u mreži koja im omogućavaju pristup novim znanjima koje su razvile druge jedinice. Međutim, to ovisi o apsorpcijskom kapacitetu tih jedinica, odnosno sposobnosti da uspješno usvoje novo znanje”.

Reagans i McEvily (2003) slažu se da mrežna struktura bitno utječe na protok znanja i inovacija. Ustanovili su da, osim razine čvrstoće povezanosti čvorišta, protok znanja olakšavaju i društvena kohezija između članova mreže i raspon mreže (broj mrežnih veza koje prelaze institucionalne, organizacijske i društvene granice). I Rowley (1997) i Braun (2004) ustanovili su da su protok znanja i lokacija unutar mreže te zemljopisna lokacija snažno povezani, pri čemu na uspješno prenošenje znanja snažno utječu mrežna kohezija i povjerenje sudionika u mrežu te njihova uključenost u samu mrežu. Koncepte zemljopisnog prostora i mrežnog prostora uveli su Huggins *et al.*, (2012). Slažu se da mreže omogućavaju pristup novim idejama, ali smatraju da se to odvija na dva načina – prvo, stvaranjem geografskih kla-

destinations demands managing destination knowledge capital which in turn is created through collaboration and partnerships within inter-organizational destination networks (European Commission, 2006; Hallin and Marnburg 2008; Shaw and Williams, 2009). Here social interaction highlights the influence of organizations, relationships and interactions to revitalise; in other words how the dynamic of the stakeholders at the destination can facilitate or inhibit the process of revitalisation.

Social network analysis allows network structures to be measured, calibrated and classified by analysing *relationships* – by flows of information and cooperation, and *nodes* – by competitive position. In other words, configuration of the destination network is critical in the revitalisation process as it inhibits or encourages the building of destination capital and both the sharing of knowledge and the communication of the revitalisation strategy to destination stakeholders (Braun, 2004; Reagans and McEvily, 2003). Here, Tsai (2001:996) argues that destination organizations can be more innovative,

“if they occupy central network positions that provide access to new knowledge developed by other units. This effect, however, depends on units’ absorptive capacity, or ability to successfully replicate new knowledge”.

Reagans and McEvily (2003) agree that network structure impacts fundamentally upon knowledge flow and innovation. They found that over and above the effect of the strength of the tie between nodes, knowledge flow is facilitated by social cohesion amongst network members and network range (the number of network ties that cross institutional, organizational, or social boundaries). Both Rowley (1997) and Braun (2004) also found a strong relationship between knowledge flow and both network and geographic positioning, with successful knowledge transfer strongly influenced by network cohesion and actors’ trust in, and engagement,

stera organizacija unutar neke destinacije i drugo, unutar mrežnog prostora koji može biti turistički distribucijski lanac ili hotelski marketing. Takva razmišljanja javljaju se i u radu o prenošenju znanja među turističkim atrakcijama Weidenfelda *et al.* (2009).

Međutim, Barthelt *et al.*, (2004) tvrde da su mreže stvorene oko geografskih klastera poput destinacija zasnovane na lokacijom ograničenom, skromnom znanju te da su nam potrebne organizacije i pojedinci koji su spremni prelaziti granice i pristupati drugim mrežama na globalnoj razini (Tushman i Scanlan, 1981). To je vrlo važno pitanje za odredišta u kojima se strategije revitalizacije mogu utopiti u lokalnome, pri čemu postoji opasnost da im promaknu rad konkurenata i promjene na tržištu. Međutim, sve veće korištenje društvenih medija za umrežavanje na globalnoj razini organizacijama i klasterima pruža jednostavan način prelaženja granica i omogućava pristup najrazličitijim izvorima znanja o revitalizaciji. Alguezaui i Filieri (2010) podupiru ideje Barthelta *et al.* (2004) te smatraju da te guste kohezivne mreže mogu biti od koristi organizacijama članicama zahvaljujući čvrstim vezama, intenzivnoj komunikaciji, prilagođavanju ponašanja i suradnji koja se zasniva na odnosima uzajamnog povjerenja, što rezultira zajedničkim viđenjem problema. Primjerice, Rowley (1997:898) smatra da „kombinacija zajedničkih očekivanja, lakoće kojom se među dionicima razmjenjuju informacije i potencijala za stvaranje koalicija, što su obilježja gustih mreža, obično proizvodi snažne ujedinjene pritiske dionika i dovodi do usuglašavanja unutar organizacije“. Međutim, postoji i opasnost da se organizacija pretjerano 'ugnijezdi' u mreži i zatvori unutar nje pa Alguezaui i Filieri (2010), suprotno navedenome, smatraju da rastrkane mreže sa slabim međusobnim vezama sadrže 'strukturne rupe' koje omogućavaju razmjenu informacija i pristup originalnijim i novijim idejama koje nastaju izvan mreže (Burt, 1992). Ustvari, organizacije bi trebale iskoristiti oba navedena pri-

with the network. Here, the concept of both geographic space and network space is introduced by Huggins *et al* (2012). They confirm the idea that networks allow access to new ideas but see this as occurring in two ways – firstly through geographical clustering of organisations in say a destination, and secondly within network space which may be a tourism distribution channel or hotel marketing collective. This is implicit within Weidenfeld's *et al* (2009) work on knowledge transfer amongst attractions.

However, Barthelt *et al* (2004) argue that networks based around a geographical cluster such as a destination are based upon locationally-constrained tacit knowledge and that what is needed is boundary-spanning organisations and individuals who can access other networks globally (Tushman and Scanlan, 1981). This is real issue for resorts where revitalisation strategies can be mired in the locality and fail to encompass competitors and the changing market place. However, the increasing use of social media for networking globally provides an easy boundary-spanning mechanism for organisations and clusters to draw upon a wide range of knowledge sources for revitalisation. Alguezaui and Filieri (2010) support Barthelt *et al*'s (2004) view by identifying that dense cohesive networks can deliver benefits to member organizations through close ties, strong communication, conforming behaviour, and cooperation based upon a trusting set of relationships leading to a shared understanding of issues. Rowley (1997:898) for example is clear that “the combination of shared expectations, the ease of information exchange between stakeholders, and the potential for coalition formation, all of which characterise dense networks, tend to produce strong unified stakeholder pressures and to lead the organization toward conformity”. However, there is a danger of the organizations being overly embedded and ‘locked in’ to the network, hence Alguezaui and Filieri's (2010) opposite claim that sparse networks with weak ties feature ‘structural holes’

stupa jer tako mogu naći ravnotežu između koristi i rizika koje svaki od njih donosi.

Da bi destinacijske mreže uspjele u revitalizaciji, njima treba upravljati jer one predstavljaju okvir za komuniciranje politika i posredovanje među dionicima. Na taj se način potiče stvaranje istinske učeće destinacije i kapitala znanja u destinaciji koji podrazumijevaju interaktivnu razmjenu znanja i povjerenje. Dobro upravljanje i vladanje mrežom potrebni su kako bi se u destinaciji postigao djelotvoran protok znanja i stvorila strategija. To će omogućiti i ulazak novih sudionika u taj proces i spriječiti da se znanja razmjenjuju samo među članovima mreže (vidi Eickelpasch i Fritsch, 2005). Aktivno sudjelovanje u formalnim ili neformalnim mrežama uvelike su prepoznati u literaturi kao najrašireniji način stjecanja znanja u turističkim destinacijama (Baggio i Cooper, 2010; Presenza i Cipollina, 2010; Scott i Ding, 2008). Društveni odnosi igraju ključnu ulogu u učećim destinacijama te se od dionika zahtijeva da naglasak stave na upravljanje odnosima jednako kao i na upravljanje procesima ili organizacijama (Beesley, 2005; Inkpen i Tsang, 2005). Istraživanja koja pružavaju izvore i načine korištenja novih ideja naglašavaju važnost društvenih odnosa jer se preferiraju osobni umjesto neosobnih izvora znanja te potvrđuju važnost mreža za osiguravanje protoka znanja i implemetaciju strategija i planova (Cross *et al.*, 2001; Xiao i Smith, 2010).

5. DESTINACIJE KAO ZAJEDNICE PRAKSE

Danas je jasno da su okolinosti za inovacije i strategije manje usmjerene na pojedinca, a više na mreže i zajednice prakse (COP). Mnoge karakteristike zajednica prakse kao konteksta za inovacije i strategije analogne su s destinacijama (Gotvassli, 2008). Razmotrimo, primjerice, deskriptore zajednice prakse i usporedimo ih s onima za destinacije:

which allow for information brokerage and access to more novel and new ideas external to the network (Burt, 1992). In fact organizations should benefit from both approaches as the gains and risks associated with each balance up.

To succeed in revitalisation, these destination networks need to be managed as they provide a framework for policy communication and intervention. This will encourage creation of a true learning destination and encourage the building of destination knowledge capital through interactive sharing and trust. Good governance and management of a network is needed in order to achieve effective knowledge flows and strategy at the destination. This will also manage new entrants and ensure that knowledge is not lost to network members (see Eickelpasch and Fritsch, 2005). Participating actively in formal or informal networks is one example of an activity that has been widely recognized in the literature as a common source of knowledge in tourism destinations (Baggio and Cooper, 2010; Presenza and Cipollina, 2010; Scott and Ding, 2008). Social relationships play a critical role in these learning destinations, requiring stakeholders to emphasize the management of relationships as well as the management of processes or organizations (Beesley, 2005; Inkpen and Tsang, 2005). Studies of how new ideas are sourced and utilized highlight the importance of these social relationships as personal rather than impersonal sources are preferred, confirming the important contribution that networks make to knowledge flow and implementing strategy and plans (Cross *et al.*, 2001; Xiao and Smith, 2010).

5. DESTINATIONS AS COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

It is now recognised that the context for innovation and strategy is less focussed on the individual, but rather that it takes place within networks and communities of practice (COPs). Here there are many character-

- Zajednica prakse je skupina pojedinaca koji razvijaju način zajedničkog rada kako bi izvršili neku svrshodnu aktivnost;
- Zajednice prakse razlikuju se od mreža po tome što imaju svrhu i ne predstavljaju samo skup odnosa;
- Povjerenje i suradnja predstavljaju važne dimenzije učinkovitih zajednica prakse;
- Zajednice prakse sve više zahtijevaju reguliranje organizacije i upravljanje;
- Zajednice prakse mogu se stvarati i iskoristiti za ostvarivanje strateške prednosti;
- Zajednice prakse imaju:
 - o Uzajamni interes da se angažiraju;
 - o Zajedničke aktivnosti i djelovanje;
 - o Zajedničku povijest i koncepte (Wenger, 1998).

Analogija s destinacijom korisna je kada je riječ o okolnostima za strategije revitalizacije jer ih odlikuje zajednička svrha i jedinstven cilj. Pripadanje destinaciji ili zajednici prakse podrazumijeva predanost organizaciji, ali zahtijeva i upravljanje kako bi se pobudio i održavao entuzijazam te zajedničku viziju i vodstvo da bi se ublažile strukture moći inherentne svim organizacijama. Možda je ono po čemu se zajednice prakse razlikuju od destinacija to što zajednice prakse ovise o visokom stupnju povjerenja (Bolisani i Scarso, 2010). A upravo je povjerenje – ili njegovo odsustvo – ključno za probleme vezane uz djelotvornu implementaciju strategija u turističkim destinacijama.

6. ZAKLJUČAK

Ovaj rad smatra da razumijevanje okolnosti zrelih destinacija kao umreženih sustava pomaže u razumijevanju procesa revitalizacije. Specifične arhitekture mreže potiču inovacije i prihvaćanje novih ideja te vode stvaranju učećih destinacija. Upravljanje mrežama i dobro vodstvo, primjerice upravljanje očekivanjima dionika i pružanje

istics of COPs as a context for innovation and strategy that are analogous with destinations (Gotvassli, 2008). Take the descriptors of a COP for example and compare them with those for a destination:

- A COP is a group of individuals who develop a shared way of working together to accomplish some purposeful activity;
- COPs differ from networks in that they have a purpose and are not just a set of relationships;
- Trust and collaboration are important dimensions of effective COPs;
- COPs increasingly need organizational regulation and management;
- COPs can be cultivated and leveraged for strategic advantage and
- COPs have:
 - o Mutual engagement interest,
 - o Common activity and action,
 - o A shared repertoire of history and concepts (Wenger, 1998).

The analogy with the destination is a useful one as a context for revitalisation strategies, inferring a common purpose and united goal. Belonging to a destination or to a COP implies commitment to that organisation but demands management to both instil and maintain drive, shared vision and leadership to moderate the power structures inherent in all organisations. Perhaps where a COP differs from a destination is in the fact that a COP depends upon a high degree of trust (Bolisani and Scarso, 2010). It is this notion of trust – or lack of it – that is central to the issues surrounding effective implementation of strategies in tourism destinations.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper is clear that understanding the context of mature destinations as networked systems aids our understanding of the revitalisation process. Particular network architectures encourage innovation and the

podrške, ključni su za uspješno uvođenje inovacija i revitalizaciju zrelih destinacija. Destinacije možemo zamisliti kao krajolike u koje se uvode inovacije i revitalizira ih se, a karakteriziraju ih dionici koji mogu otežavati, spriječiti ili prihvatiti nove ideje koje se nalaze u samom srcu strategija revitalizacije. Dobro upravljanje destinacijskom mrežom dovest će do stvaranja organizacija učećih destinacija, pri čemu su zrela odredišta u boljem položaju prilagoditi se i pristupiti obnavljanju i stvaranju konkurentske prednosti za budućnost.

adoption of new ideas, leading to the building of learning destinations. Network governance and leadership are key to successful innovation and revitalisation of mature destinations through the management of stakeholder expectations and galvanising support. We can envisage destinations as landscapes for innovation and revitalisation, characterised by stakeholders who can inhibit, prevent or adopt the new ideas which lie at the heart of any revitalisation strategy. By good management of the destination network, destination learning organizations will be created, meaning that mature resorts are better placed to adapt and innovate and therefore gain competitive advantage for the future.

LITERATURA - REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, S. (2012a) Relational spatiality and resort restructuring. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 39. No. 1. pp. 134-154
2. Agarwal, S. (2012b) Resort economy and direct economic linkages. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 39. No. 3. pp. 1470-1494
3. Agarwal, S., Brunt, P. (2006) Social exclusion and English seaside resorts. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 27. No. 4. pp. 654-670
4. Alguezaui, S., Filieri, R. (2010) Investigating the role of social capital in innovation: sparse versus dense network. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 14. No. 6. pp. 891-890
5. Baggio, R., Cooper, C. (2010) Knowledge transfer in a tourism destination: the effects of a network structure. *The Service Industries Journal*. Vol. 30. No. 10. pp. 1757-1771.
6. Barthelt, H., Malmberg, A., Maskell, P. (2004) Cluster and knowledge: Local buzz, global pipelines and the process of knowledge creation. *Progress in Human Geography*. Vol. 28. No. 1. pp. 31-56
7. Beatty, C., Fothergill, S. (2004) Economic change and the labour market in Britain's seaside towns. *Regional Studies*. Vol. 38. No. 5. pp. 461-480
8. Beatty, C., Fothergill, S., Wilson, I. (2008) *England's Seaside Towns: A Benchmarking Study*, London: Communities and Local Government.
9. Beatty, C., Fothergill, S., Wilson, I. (2009) *Seaside Towns In Wales: A Benchmarking Study*. Cardiff: Visit Wales.
10. Beesley, L. (2005) The management of emotion in collaborative tourism research settings. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 26. No. 2. pp. 261-275
11. Blackpool Challenge Partnership (no date) *A Regeneration Strategy for Blackpool*. Blackpool: Blackpool Challenge Partnership.
12. Bolisani, E., Scarso, E. (2010) The place of communities of practice in knowledge management studies: a critical review. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 18. No. 2. pp. 366-381
13. Braun, P. (2004) Regional tourism networks: the nexus between ICT diffusion and change in Australia. *Informati-*

- on Technology & Tourism*. Vol. 6. No. 4. pp. 231-243
14. Burt, R. (1992) *Structural Holes: the Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, Mas: Harvard University Press
 15. Clegg, A., Essex, S. (2000) Restructuring in tourism: The accommodation sector in a major British coastal resort, *International Journal of Tourism Research*. Vol. 2. No. 2. pp. 77- 95
 16. Cohen, W. M., Levinthal, D. A. (1990) Absorptive capacity: a new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 35. No. 1. pp. 128-152
 17. Coles, T., Shaw, G. (2006) Tourism, property and the management of change in coastal resorts: perspectives from South West England. *Current issues in Tourism*. Vol. 9. No. 9. pp. 46-68
 18. Communities and Local Government (2010) *Strategy for Seaside Success: Securing the Future of Seaside Economies*. London: Communities and Local Government.
 19. Cooper, C. (1997) Parameters and indicators of the decline of the British seaside resort. In: Shaw, G., Williams, A.M. (eds.) *The Rise and Fall of British Coastal Resorts*. London: Pinter. pp. 79-101
 20. Cooper, C., Prideaux, B., Ruhanen, L. (2003) *Expanding the Horizons of Tourism Research: Developing a Knowledge Management Approach to Research Funded by the Cooperative Research Center for Sustainable Tourism*. CAUTHE Conference Proceedings.
 21. Cooper, C. (2006) The Anatomy of the Rejuvenation Stage of the TALC. In: Butler, R. W. (ed.) *The Tourism Area Life Cycle*. Clevedon: Channel View. Vol. 2. pp. 183-200
 22. Cross, R., Parker, A., Prusak, L., Borgatti, S. P. (2001) Knowing what we know: supporting knowledge creation and sharing in social networks. *Organizational Dynamics*. Vol. 30. No. 2. pp. 100-120
 23. Dvir, R., Pasher, E. (2004) Innovation engines for knowledge cities: an innovation ecology perspective. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 8. No. 5. pp. 16-27
 24. Eickelpasch, A., Fritsch, M. (2005) Contests for cooperation - A new approach in German innovation policy. *Research Policy*. Vol. 34. pp. 1269-1282
 25. European Commission (2002) *Early Warning System for Identifying Declining Tourist Destinations, and Preventive Best Practices*. Brussels: European Commission.
 26. European Commission (2006) *Innovation in Tourism: How to Create a Tourism Learning Area - The Handbook*. Brussels: European Commission.
 27. Gotvassli, K-A. (2008) Community knowledge – a catalyst for innovation. *Regional Analysis and Policy*. Vol. 38. No. 2. pp. 145-158
 28. Hall, M. C., Williams, A. M. (2008) *Tourism and Innovation*. London: Routledge.
 29. Hallin, C. A., Marnburg, E. (2008) Knowledge management in the hospitality industry: A review of empirical research. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 29. No. 2. pp. 366-381
 30. Healy, P. (2006) Relational complexity and the imaginative power of strategic spatial planning. *European Planning Studies*. Vol. 14. No. 4. pp. 525-546
 31. Hjalager, A. M. (2010) A review of innovation research in tourism. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 31. No. 1. pp. 1-12
 32. House of Commons (2007) *Coastal Towns Second Report of Session 2006–07*. London: The Stationery Office.
 33. Huggins, R., Johnston, A., Thompson, P. (2012) Network capital, social capital

- and knowledge flow: How the nature of inter-organizational networks impacts on innovation. *Industry and Innovation*. Vol. 19. No. 3. pp. 203-232
34. Inkpen, A. C., Tsang, E. W. K. (2005) Social capital, networks and knowledge transfer. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 30. No. 1. pp. 146-165
 35. Kanerva, M., Hollanders, H., Arundel, A. (2006) *Trend Chart Report 2006: Can We Measure and Compare Innovation in Services?* Maastricht: Maastricht Economic Research Institute on Innovation and Technology
 36. Leonard, A. R. (2016) Seaside town regeneration and the interconnection between the physical environment, key agencies and mid-life migration. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*. Vol. 8. No. 1-3. pp. 107-126
 37. Market and Coastal Towns Association (2011) *Key Business Areas April 2006 – March 2011*. Taunton: Market and Coastal Towns Association.
 38. McElduff, L., Peel, D., Lloyd, M. G. (2013) Informing a framework for coastal planning on the island of Ireland. *Town Planning Review*. Vol. 84. No. 4. pp. 419-440
 39. Nijssen, E. J., Hillebrand, B., Vermeulen, P. A. M., Kemp, J. G. M. (2006) Exploring product and service innovation similarities and differences. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*. Vol. 23. pp. 241-251
 40. OECD (2006) *Innovation and Growth in Tourism*. Paris: OECD.
 41. Presenza, A., Cipollina, M. (2010) Analyzing tourism stakeholder networks. *Tourism Review*. Vol. 65. No. 4. pp. 17-30
 42. Reagans, R., McEvily, B. (2003) Network structure and knowledge transfer: The effects of cohesion and range. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol. 48. No. 2. pp. 240-267
 43. Rowley, T. J. (1997) Moving beyond dyadic ties: A network theory of stakeholder influences. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol. 22. No. 4. pp. 887-910
 44. Saxena, G. (2014) Cross-sector regeneration partnership strategies and tourism. *Tourism Planning and Development*. Vol. 11. No. 4. pp. 86-105
 45. Schianetz, K., Kavanagh, L., Lockington, D. (2007) The learning tourism destination: The potential of a learning organisation approach for improving the sustainability of tourism destinations. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 28. pp. 1485-1496
 46. Scott, N., Ding, P. (2008) Management of tourism research knowledge in Australia and China. *Current Issues in Tourism*. Vol. 11. No. 6. pp. 514-528
 47. Scott, N., Baggio, R., and Cooper, C. (2008) *Network Analysis and Tourism: From Theory to Practice*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
 48. Shared Intelligence (no date) *What Future for England's Struggling Seaside Towns?* Briefing Paper. London: Shared Intelligence.
 49. Shaw, G., Williams, A. M. (eds.) (1997) *The Rise and Fall of British Coastal Resorts*. London: Pinter.
 50. Shaw, G., Williams, A. M. (2009) Knowledge transfer and management in tourism organizations: An emerging research agenda. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 30. pp. 325-335
 51. Swan, J., Newell, S., Scarborough, H., Hislop, D. (1999) Knowledge management and innovation: networks and networking. *Journal of Knowledge Management*. Vol. 3. No. 4. pp. 262-275
 52. Tsai, W. (2001) Knowledge transfer in intraorganizational networks: effects of network position and absorptive capacity

- on business, unit innovation and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 44. No. 5. pp. 996-1004
53. Tushman, M. L., Scanlan, T. J. (1981) Boundary spanning individuals: Their role in information transfer and their antecedents. *Academy of Management Journal*. Vol. 24. No. 2. pp. 289-305
 54. Walton, J. K. (1983) *The English Seaside Resort. A Social History 1750-1914*. London: Pinter.
 55. Weidenfeld, A., Williams, A. M., Butler, R. W. (2009) Knowledge transfer and innovation among attractions. *Annals of Tourism Research*. Vol. 37. No. 3. pp. 604-626
 56. Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice, Learning, Meaning and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 57. Xiao, H., Smith, S. L. J. (2010) Professional communication in an applied tourism research community. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 31. No. 3. pp. 402-411
 58. Yang, J. T., Wan, C-S. (2004) Advancing organizational effectiveness and knowledge management implementation. *Tourism Management*. Vol. 25. pp. 593-601
- Primljeno: 30. rujna 2016. / Submitted: 30 September 2016*
- Prihvaćeno: 20. listopada 2016. / Accepted: 20 October 2016*